



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/614,721	07/12/2000	Katsushi Matsuda	NEC-F82/USA	2343

30743 7590 05/05/2005

WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 340
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/614,721

Applicant(s)

MATSUDA ET AL.

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07/12/00 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to amendment filed 02/25/05.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lizuka et al. (US 6424980) (Lizuka).

Regarding claim 2, Lizuka discloses: An information retrieval apparatus comprising: a data monitoring (12, fig. 5 and corresponding text, Lizuka) and content judging means for monitoring a document retrieved from a database (15, Fig. 5, Lizuka) in inferring a field with this document belongs to (col. 11, lines 62 to col. 12, lines 16, Lizuka); and

A retrieval screen generating means for generating a retrieval screen for a user to perform a retrieval operation taking the inferred field as an object of retrieval (col. 15, lines 15-33, Lizuka) and outputting the retrieval screen as data to be displayed together with said retrieved document (col. 15, lines 1-12, Lizuka), wherein document retrieved from said database is a structured document (col. 11, lines 46-61, Lizuka)

Said retrieval screen is a screen of a structured document in which screen a retrieval part is embedded in the retrieval structured document and a user can retrieve (col. 15, lines 15 to col. 16, lines 67, Lizuka).

Regarding claim 3, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 2 above. In addition, Lizuka discloses: said retrieval screen is a screen of a structured document in which screen a retrieval part is separate in the retrieval structured document and a user can retrieve (col. 15, lines 15 to col. 16, lines 67, Lizuka).

Regarding claims 4 and 8, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 2 and 3 above, respectively. In addition, Lizuka discloses: wherein output of said retrieval screen generating means is supplied to an input/output means for retrieving and displaying a document stored in said database (col. 13, lines 5-25, Lizuka); and said input/output means displays a retrieval screen outputted by said retrieval screen generating means and retrieval again another document stored in said database by a retrieval operation performed by a user according to this retrieval screen (col. 13, lines 7-25, Lizuka).

Regarding claim 5, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 2 above. In addition, Lizuka discloses: said data monitoring and content judging means infers a field which the structured document belongs to, using as a criterion of judgment either

Art Unit: 2161

one or both of the content of text data contained in the structured document and the number of links (col. 34, lines 38-54, Lizuka).

Regarding claim 6, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 2 above. In addition, Lizuka discloses: wherein a document retrieved from said database is given in advance the information for identifying its field (col. 11, lines 62 to col. 12, lines 16, Lizuka); said data monitoring and content judging means notifies said retrieval screen generating means of a field represented by said identifying information (col. 33, lines 16-40, Lizuka).

Regarding claim 7, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 2 and 4. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2161


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4023. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.


Cindy Nguyen
April 26, 2005


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER